

**Kulis Land Use Plan****PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC MEETING NOTES**

**March 30, 2010, Kincaid Elementary School**

<b>Open House</b>	<b>7:00 – 8:00 p.m.</b>
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>8:00 – 8:30 p.m.</b>
<b>Questions&amp; Comments</b>	<b>8:30 – 9:30 p.m.</b>

- Project Team Representation

**ANC:** John Parrott, John Johansen, Jack Jones

**DOWL HKM:** Tom Middendorf, Maryellen Tuttell , Brian Hanson, Colleen Wilt, Jessica Semmler, Steve Pavish (Northern Horizon), Tim Potter

- Attendance

70 attendees recorded on the sign-in sheet.

---

- Open House

Attendees were able to visit project display stations, view project information, ask questions, and share comments on the Kulis Land Use Plan. Display stations presented information on the project overview and objectives, preliminary land use options, and community concerns.

---

- Presentation

John Parrott, ANC, opened the meeting, welcomed and thanked those in attendance, and reinforced the desire to receive public participation and input throughout the planning process.

Tom Middendorf, DOWL HKM, introduced the purpose of this second public meeting, the project goals and objectives, and schedule.

Brian Hanson, DOWL HKM, presented the preliminary land use and phased development options.

Steve Pavish, Northern Horizon, discussed the single developer option.

Maryellen Tuttell, DOWL HKM, presented community concerns identified thus far in the planning process (noise, traffic, aesthetics, environmental contamination, construction activity, utilities).

---

• Questions & Comments

Q = Question    R = Response    C = Comment

Q: I live next to the fence on Air Guard Road – what are the plans for the perimeter road on the Kulis side of the fence?

R: *No changes or development are proposed by the Kulis Land Use Plan project, but the airport may continue to use the road for emergency/security purposes.*

Q: What type of barrier will be used to mitigate the elevation changes on the east side of the Kulis property?

R: *Slope stability will be considered in any design for the site, which would include consideration of retaining walls.*

C: (From resident on northern end of Air Guard Road) Come visit my house to see where it is – the house is at the highest elevation on Air Guard Road and will sit higher than the proposed apron after development. Concerned about impact of excavation and whether change in slope will threaten home.

R: The Project Team will visit the neighborhood to see the sloped areas.

Q: What potential development on the south side of Runway 7R would justify Design Group V aircraft?

R: *If Design Group V aircraft use the site (which is not a foregone conclusion), it is anticipated that they would only use/occupy lots with frontage on the proposed parallel taxiway, most likely for maintenance purposes.*

Q: (From resident on northern end of Air Guard Road) What will the airport do about property value decreases due to the near-term drastic changes proposed for the upper northeast corner of the Kulis site?

R: *The airport is not planning to do anything about property value. There are existing aviation operations conducted out of the northeast corner of the site, and it is not yet known how new development and activity conducted on that same area would affect property value. The goal of the preliminary land use options is to leave the vegetative buffer and sloped area as undisturbed as possible.*

C: The Air Guard has already made changes to its site and caused loss of trees and buffer to the neighboring community. Further development and elevation changes will contribute to further loss of the natural barriers.

R: *The goal of the preliminary land use options is to leave the vegetative buffer and sloped area as undisturbed as possible.*

C: (From resident on northern end of Air Guard Road) The last house on this road gets the ugliest view.

C: Vibrations from aircraft are an issue to the site neighbors.

C: Helicopter traffic from Kulis has been very respectful of the neighborhood. Small aircraft are often very noisy.

C: The airport should dedicate some of the acreage coming under its control to natural environment/vegetation.

- C: Airport neighbors bought homes with some recognition of noise, but the increase due to development is beyond what residents accepted as part of the conditions when buying.
- C: More clarification of the short-term and long-term development options is desired.
- C: Neighbors to the east of the site would like the opportunity to walk the site with the project team and better communicate impacts.
- R: *The Kulis Advisory Group did get a tour of the site, and although it may not be possible for Kulis to accommodate a large group from the public, members of the project team would be happy to arrange and participate in a walking tour of the site from Air Guard Road.*
- C: Appreciate Tom Middendorf walking around the neighborhood on Air Guard Road to talk with residents in advance of tonight's public meeting – excellent job.
- C: Revegetate the disturbed areas.
- Q: Has anyone come to the airport with interest in development?
- R: *Over the years, parties have contacted the airport with interest, and during this project some potential tenants expressed interests during a Business Interest Survey. Development is largely tenant-driven; i.e., if there are no interested tenants, there will be no development of infrastructure.*
- C: (From resident on northern end of Air Guard Road) The existing tree buffer is not substantial, and the proposed new road would disturb what little buffer there is. Could the proposed road be moved further to the west?
- R: *The project team will take into consideration visibility and buffer depth, however the airport has a responsibility to the FAA, the city, and the community to use its property for aviation purposes. The eventual design will have to be a balance between airport/FAA and community needs.*
- C: South Airpark is an example of actions not matching words. The noise and air pollution and other impacts from this site are already a problem. Kulis will multiply that problem. If the airport cannot control noise, it should not develop.
- C: The airport should never have built the South Air Park or Kulis – these are already in the buffer area. The original airport development never intended for development to occur as far south as it did.
- Q: When will we know if Option 4 (the single developer option) is viable?
- R: *Following discussions with the airport, the project team will likely develop a recommended option that combines the best elements of Options 1-3 with comments heard from the public. Option 4 may still be a possible land use option, but ANC could use the project's recommended option in its discussions with a site developer to guide development. If Option 4 were to be realized, ANC may participate in the utilities and surface infrastructure (roads, taxiway) or require the developer to make those improvements, The developer would be responsible for the buildings and other improvements.*
- Q: How and when will the airport know whether/when/how much roads and taxiways to develop?

- R: *It will be a judgment call based on interest and commitments from potential tenants. The airport may develop some roads and taxiways in advance to attract tenants and defer additional development until commitment from tenants is obtained.*
- Q: What are the plans for the building in the southeast corner of the site?
- R: *A civil support team from the Army Guard will likely use the site as a launch point for rapid response to certain events for which the convenience of airport access is desirable.*
- C: (From John Parrott, ANC Airport Manager) Because ANC has accepted federal land and funds as an airport, federal constraints prevent ANC from denying interested aviation users the opportunity to use/develop available space. The airport is required to provide areas for aeronautical uses, and if developable land exists, that land retains the potential to be developed at some point.
- C: Tim Pine introduced himself and Ed Fogels as the two Sand Lake Community Council representatives on the Kulis Advisory Group. He indicated that they would ensure the community concerns are heard, but he encouraged community members to be active and definitive in expressing their individual concerns and issues at public meetings and through other channels.
- C: Handouts from the meeting would have been appreciated.
- C: Tim Pine encouraged community members to review other community members' comments and involve their neighbors to discuss the project impacts to the community.
- C: Tim Pine encouraged community members to review comments and concerns documented by the project team to ensure accuracy.
- C: Tim Pine indicated that neither the airport nor the municipality controls site lighting and that there is no guarantee that the outcomes of this plan will hold true indefinitely.
- C: Tim Pine encouraged the community to consider all traffic contributors, not just Kulis, to understand the full impact of future traffic. The West Anchorage District Plan has noted traffic as an issue but has not yet addressed it.
- Q: Is any of the proposed development affected by zoning laws?
- R: *Title 21 is under revision, but in general, the municipality leaves land use inside the airport's air operations area (AOA) to the jurisdiction of the airport.*
- Q: With all the federal "strings" attached to property use, who decides what eventually gets developed?
- R: *The FAA has already mandated that airport property be developed to support aviation use, to the extent there is demand. The Airport proposes to the FAA the type and layout of future development.*
- Q: If the decisions have already been made, why are we here?
- R: *The airport does not have the ability to say that airport property will not be developed, but the airport and the public process can affect many aspects of how, when, what, and where properties are developed. The airport also has a measure of control over operations. For example, if nighttime noise is a great concern, the airport can impose limits on the types and times of use for the site.*

C: If the setback (buffer) is small enough so as not to be practically developable by a third party, that would help create a sustainable buffer. Otherwise, available land retains the possibility of being developed at some point.

R: Yes, that is true.

Q: Could the north-south running fence along Air Guard Road be moved to the west for some reason? Environment? Security?

R: *It is not likely that it could be moved for environmental reasons, but security reasons may be investigated, and the airport would entertain the possibility of a land swap with the municipality to increase the buffer area.*

C: John Parrott updated those in attendance on this summer's construction plans for Taxiway Z. There will be an asphalt plant on airport property, so no asphalt will be trucked on Raspberry Road. This will reduce the truck traffic and prevent the asphalt litter on the road. The aggregate will still be trucked along Raspberry, but by using RAP (recycled asphalt pavement) from other areas of the airport, the number of loads required from offsite will be reduced.

---

### • Other Issues Identified and Comments Collected from Open House and Comment Forms

During engine maintenance, there is air pollution when the wind is from the west.

Traffic has increased in the last three months.

Getting helicopters out of Kulis would be good. The commercial helicopters at South Air Park are not as bad.

Concerned about any changes to Air Guard Road.

Sight distance issues when trying to turn left from Air Guard Road and traffic coming to the east is moving too fast.

A new hangar has been constructed on South Air Park within the last three weeks.

South Air Park noise is worse than takeoff and landing noise for folks behind the school.

We hate Option 2.

Are there options for buy-outs?

As a community member, I believe development option #1 is best due to the way the runway and taxiways will be facing. There is no direct jet blast into the housing area.

Long term layout #3 seems to be the best plan to minimize noise and jet blast to housing and the community.

My personal opinion is some buildings should lease 20 years non-aviation. That will give time to further assess need.

Other environmental considerations that should be addressed in the Land Use Plan:

- Odors/air pollution emissions generated near residential areas by aircraft operations.
- How leveling/changing topography will affect drainage to the lower level residential areas to the east.

What public input is afforded the neighbors for Option #4?

Build a berm on the existing Kulis perimeter road and plant now so that 20-30 years of growth occurs before development occurs.

Lighting impacts on adjacent areas: airport needs to provide enforceable standards for details.

I purchased my home during the summer of 2009. I clearly know I live a house away from the airport. I knew there would be noise – noise is not my concern. I knew the future of Kulis is up in the air. I am concerned that each plan/option I have been shown calls for a bigger and newer perimeter road. I am concerned that building this road means clearing the tree buffer. Trees don't block all that much noise – but they do block a view (a view that could easily be of a parking lot or the back of a large building). I bought here because of mature trees. Please consider moving that eastern road [the proposed new road] over toward the east. Even an easy 20 feet would provide some natural buffer.